· —	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	09/925,214	MOISE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas L Dickey	2826
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) <u>Thomas L Dickey</u>	(3)	
(2) <u>Pamela Lau Kee</u>	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>15 May 2003</u>	Time: <u>6:20 pm</u>	
Type of Interview: Telephonic Video Conference Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applic Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 39.57 Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WA	AS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a wri	tten summary of the substance in interview. since the interview
Minhloan Tran Primary Examiner Art Unit 2826		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant	:/Applicant's Representative S	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed. On 4/16/03 applicant amended claims 39 and 57 into independent form, incorporating all the limitations of claims 35-36 and 53-54 respectively. For clarity, applicant changed the order in which the limitations were introduced and applicant changed the names of some of the elements. These changes were discussed. It was agreed that applicant did not intend to change the scope of claims 39 and 57. The examiner suggested further changes for clarity. It was agreed that these further changes would be made to the claims via examiner's amendment, should the examiner be required to send a notice of allowance in response to the 4/16/03 amendment.